

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	ı	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/872,865	06/01/2001		William L. Nighan JR.	17960-231	2051
25213	7590	09/14/2004	EXAMIN		INER
HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP				RODRIGUEZ, ARMANDO	
275 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD MENLO PARK, CA 94025-3506			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
MENEOTA	icit, Ori	7-1023-3300		2828	

DATE MAILED: 09/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/872,865	NIGHAN ET AL.				
,, ,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ	2828				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 16 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the comment whick the contract which are the contrac	ation. A proper reply to a				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.				
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen						
10. Other:	, r = -\\					
		· •				

MINSUN HARVEY Supervisor Art Unit 2828 Continuation of 2. NOTE: Applicant's arguments filed on August 16, 2004 have been considered but are not persuasive for the reasons discussed in the final rejection mailed on April 19, 2004, in particular both applicant's claimed invention and the cited prior art to Amano disclosed a laser system having the same elements and the same structural arrangement. Claims 1 and 16 raise new issues and require a new search, claim 1 has been amended to change the efficiency from 23% to 20%, which was not previously considered and claim 16 has been amended to change the axial modes from four to three, which was not previously considered.